

**F A X**

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 05 2007**

William L. Botjer Esq.  
PO Box 478  
Center Moriches NY 11934  
**631 874 4826**

---

To: **USPTO AU 2611**

Fax number: **571 273 8300**

From: William L. Botjer Esq.

Fax number: 781 846 8354

Business phone: 631 874 4826

Home phone:

Date & Time: **01/05/07 5:05 PM**

Pages: **24**

Re: **Amendment, IDS form and Paper in SN 10/627,088**

---

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 05 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Barman et al.**

Serial No: **10/627,088**

Group art Unit: **2611**

Filed: **07/25/2003**

Examiner: **TSE, YOUNG TOI**

Atty. Docket: **HSF-005**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

AMENDMENT

Sir:

Please enter the following amendment:

---

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the US Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed as below, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 571 273 8300, on the date set forth below.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Dated: January 5, 2007

By   
(Signature)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 05 2007

**A. Introductory Comments**

Based on the amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This amendment is responsive to the office action dated October 6, 2006. In the office action, the listing of references in the specification was said to be not a proper information disclosure statement. The drawings were objected to because the unknown errors " $df_{st}$ " and " $df_{ct}$ " in figure 1 do not correspond to the unknown errors " $\delta f_{st}$ " and " $\delta f_{ct}$ " discussed in the specification. The drawings were also objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Claims 2-3, 5 and 7 were objected to due to informalities in the claim language. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to insufficient antecedent basis. Furthermore, in claim 1, the computing steps (d) and (f), in claim 2, steps (h) and (i), in claim 6, steps (d) and (f), and in claim 7, steps (h) and (i) lack cooperation with the other steps in the claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 respectively. Also, in claim 2, steps (a) to (k) were said to be confusing since claim 1 already used steps (a) to (f).

Enclosed herewith is a Form PTO-1449 listing reference which applicants wish to have considered in this examination together with a copy of a publication. It is requested that Deposit Account No.502158 be charged for the reference consideration fee as well as for any other fees required for entry of this amendment.

In response to the rejections the specification and claims have been amended as set forth in the next section.